

JUL 02 2007

67,108-215
Meda 2**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Meda, Rajasekhar Venkat
Serial Number: 10/607,622
Filed: 06/27/2003
Group Art Unit: 2617
Examiner: Daniel, Jr., Willie J.
Title: WIRELESS CUSTOMER SEGMENTATION
AND MARKETING PROCESS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed on May 1, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the *Ward* reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,922,562). The Examiner interprets the *Ward* reference as including "determining a history of an identification of a mobile within a visitor location register" and "determining whether a user of the mobile is a visitor to the location based upon the determined history." Applicant respectfully disagrees because the *Ward* reference does not include such a history. At best, the *Ward* reference includes a visitor tracking database 408 that is associated with a visitor identifier and location processor 406 (column 10, lines 37-57). As is clear from Figure 4 and the discussion in column 10, the visitor tracking database 408 is not part of the visitor location

67,108-215
Meda 2

register 125. Therefore, even if information from the visitor tracking database 408 could be construed as a history, that is not from or in the visitor location register 125. Therefore, the *Ward* reference does not anticipate claims 17-19 and Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 of claims 17-19 based upon the *Ward* reference. Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 which are all based upon the *Ward* reference and the Examiner's interpretation of the *Ward* reference mentioned above. The *Ward* reference does not teach what the Examiner states in the Office Action and, therefore, even if the proposed combinations could be made, the result is not the same things as what the Examiner contends and does not provide the result of Applicant's invention. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness against any of Applicant's claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

It is worth noting that Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement on page 18 of the Office Action where the Examiner contends that claim 17 is the same invention as claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. No such admission was made. Further, if the claims were the same, then the Examiner's rejection of them would also be the same. The fact that the Examiner had to make different rejections of those claims indicates that the claims are not the same. As mentioned above, neither of the rejections should be maintained because the *Ward*

JUL 02 2007

67,108-215
Meda 2

reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation nor does it establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By. 

David J. Gaskey, Reg. No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: July 2, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this Request for Reconsideration relative to Application Serial No. 10/607,622 is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (571) 273-3300) on July 2, 2007


Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES\IP00215\PATENT\Request for Reconsideration 7-2-07.doc